



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,988	07/31/2002	Xiaoning Nie	1406/52	9022
25297	7590	01/25/2006		
JENKINS, WILSON & TAYLOR, P. A. 3100 TOWER BLVD SUITE 1200 DURHAM, NC 27707			EXAMINER RIZZUTO, KEVIN P	
			ART UNIT 2183	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/088,988

Applicant(s)

NIE, XIAONING

Examiner

Kevin P. Rizzuto

Art Unit

2183

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues:

"In contrast to the present invention, Auslander neither teaches nor suggests a post-condition which specifies that a conditional jump is to be processed and the corresponding flag bits of an arithmetic-logic unit are to be checked. The inventive advantages of such a post-condition which is checked itself and which initiates the check of flag bits of an arithmetic-logic unit corresponding to the post-condition are as follows."

Examiner finds these arguments unpersuasive for the following reasons:

Auslander teaches a post-condition (BI field in the BT and BF instructions, bits 6-11, page 33). The BI field specifies that a conditional jump is to be processed and the corresponding flag bits of an arithmetic-logic unit are to be checked. The BI field is sent to the Bit Select Decode unit 60, and specifies to the Bit Select Decode unit 60 to check the corresponding flag bits via the AND MASK 70. Examiner further notes that the BI field is made up of a plurality of bits, which are checked (by Bit Select Decode 60, fig. 4). Based on the result of the checking of the corresponding flag bits, the conditional jump is processed. Therefore, it also specifies that a conditional jump is to be processed.

Lastly, Examiner notes that elsewhere in the Remarks, Applicant appears to be arguing features associated with the post-condition that are not found in the claims. For instance, that the post-condition bits themselves are checked to determine whether or not to execute the branch instruction as opposed to specifying other bits to check whether or not to execute the branch. Applicant appears to be relying upon the limitation, "and a post-condition, which specifies that a conditional jump is to be processed" for this argument. However, this limitation does not necessitate the feature Applicant is arguing. Also, Applicant argues, "after a positive check of the post-condition itself, the corresponding flag bits are checked," however this limitation is not found in the claims. Applicant is reminded that, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.



WILLIAM M. TREAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER